
Notable Opposition to H.R. 5

American Federation of Teachers, AFL-CIO

“The bill walks away from the commitment our nation made 50 years ago to help our country’s disadvantaged children. The Elementary and Secondary Education Act was intended to provide federal education resources to public schools to help level the playing field for targeted populations of disadvantaged students—and it has been doing so for more than 50 years. Under the bill, money for English language learners or low-income students could be redirected to programs serving entirely different populations.”

Autism National Committee, Inc.

“While students with disabilities have made some progress under the current version of ESEA, significant achievement gaps persist. We fear that the Student Success Act will not remedy those gaps, but will widen them. Students with disabilities need more support and higher expectations from schools; not less.”

Consortium for Citizens with Disabilities

“The Student Success Act does not fully support students with disabilities and in fact, it creates incentives for schools and districts to take students with disabilities, unchecked, off track from having equitable access to and achieving a regular high school diploma. Incidence data reflects that less than one percent of all students have the most significant cognitive disabilities (which correspond to roughly 10% of students with disabilities). Without this limitation, we fear that schools may inappropriately assign students to the alternate assessment. Data show assignment to an AA-AAS may lead to reduced access to the general curriculum and limit a student’s access to earn a regular diploma.”

Business Roundtable, Council of Parent Attorneys and Advocates, The Education Trust, National Council of La Raza, Democrats for Education Reform, U.S. Chamber of Commerce, The Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights, National Center for Learning Disabilities

“We are especially worried about the accountability section. Without much-needed changes, parents across America will not be able to be confident that their child’s school will actively partner with them in getting their child to state standards and graduation regardless of background or disability.”

Committee for Education Funding

“When factoring in cuts to ESEA programs that were enacted in FY 2011 and 2012, HR 5 locks in almost \$1.7 billion in cuts compared to the FY 2010 appropriated level.”

College Board

“The elimination of Title 1 Part G funding threatens the steady growth in participation of low-income students in rigorous high school coursework that not only prepares them to succeed in college, but can save students and families thousands of dollars in college tuition.”

National Association of Secondary School Principals, National Association of Elementary School Principals, American Federation of School Administrators

“Our organizations are disappointed that the bill would authorize funding for Title I at \$16.2 billion for FY 2016–2021, which is the same amount appropriated by Congress for FY 2015. As the Committee's own fact sheet notes, this amount is "lower than the Title I authorization for the last year it was authorized" under NCLB in 2001. This is obviously unacceptable for the many schools serving low-income students that are eligible for Title I funds, including the middle and high schools that never receive such funding because of the high need in their feeder elementary schools.”

National Association of School Psychologists

“The proposed legislation fails to recognize the importance of prevention and intervention services that are critical to supporting student learning, and eliminates or consolidates a number of funding sources that are explicitly dedicated to ensuring access to these services (including the Elementary and Secondary School Counseling Program).”

National Center for Learning Disabilities

“NCLD opposes any effort to expand the very limited use of the AA-AAS beyond students with the most significant cognitive disabilities, who are estimated to comprise less than 1% of the entire student population. The bill is severely misguided as it creates a major loophole in assessing students with disabilities, which could likely result in the exclusion of countless students with disabilities from the general assessment.”

“Without the maintenance of effort provision, states and local school districts will be free to slash education budgets while remaining eligible to receive annual Title I federal funds, thus weakening the power of federal investments to raise achievement for disadvantaged children.”

National Coalition for Public Education:

“We oppose portability not only because it could lead to vouchers, but also because it would have a negative impact on students and schools most in need. Portability dilutes the funds, stretches the dollars thinner, and diminishes the effectiveness of the funding.”

National Women’s Law Center

H.R. 5 “eliminates the federal focus on improving the achievement of underprivileged students by – among other things – abandoning accountability for the education of subgroups, eliminating goals for student growth and improvement, ignoring disparities in the distribution of resources, and allowing federal funds targeted for vulnerable groups of students, such as English language learners and Native American students, to be allocated for other purposes.”

National Center for Special Education in Charter Schools

“NCSECS wants to ensure that the 2.5 million K-12 students attending public charter schools nationwide – including the nearly 250,000 IDEA-eligible students – are fully supported within state accountability systems that generate progress toward college and career readiness. The bill, as currently drafted does not promote or support the important nexus between flexibility and accountability that NCSECS believes is fundamental to a reauthorized ESEA.”